

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **Consultancy: Close of Project Evaluation United Nations Peacebuilding Priority Plan 2015 - 2017**

<b>Location:</b>	Bougainville (with travel to other locations in the Autonomous Region of Bougainville), Papua New Guinea
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	Individual Contract (IC)
<b>Project:</b>	Peacebuilding Fund projects
<b>Languages Required:</b>	English
<b>Starting Date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> May 2018
<b>Duration of Initial Contract:</b>	May 2018 – July 2018 (30 working days)

## **Background**

### **(i) Peacebuilding Priority Plan Rationale**

The Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) is the standard PBF funding instrument for a Primary Response Facility (PRF) grant. It serves as a contract between the PBF and the Joint Steering Committee, with a maximum duration of 36 months (3 years). In late 2013, following the UN Secretary General's declaration of PNG's eligibility for support from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), the UN and Autonomous Bougainville Government undertook an extensive and highly participatory peace and development analysis (PDA), facilitated by Interpeace. The consultations took more than three months with more than 1,000 people from all regions of Bougainville and relevant stakeholders outside the region contributing.

In summary, the PDA found that Bougainville should not be classified as post-conflict because the historical drivers of conflict remain present today. According to the PDA findings, there are probably more contributing factors to conflict now than there were in the 1970s and 1980s. The PDA identified the following as current conflict factors: (1) resistance to "outsiders" because of perceived threat to Bougainville resources, culture and identity; (ii) unequal distribution of benefits and costs from Panguna mine and from other natural resources; (iii) internal (communal) jealousies and disputes over land and other resources, which do not have easily accessible non-monetised means of mean of resolution.

The Peacebuilding Priority Plan was a result of the PDA findings' recommendations. The outcome areas of this Priority Plan are all equally important and inter-related but are listed in order of their suggested strategic sequencing with a view to addressing the peacebuilding efforts in Bougainville. Building political relationship and trust between the governments is key to garner the political will to support progress towards achievement of the Bougainville Peace Agreement including addressing the communication needs surrounding its three main pillars. However, it is important to note that all three outcome areas are interrelated and that success and progress in each outcome area will contribute to the overall outcome and objectives of the PBF support. Hence, outcome 3 to address community cohesion is equally important to outcome 1 and outcome 2 as certain underlying social and cohesion issues need to be addressed to address conflict drivers that still exist which pose a threat to peace

and the risk of conflict. Issues such as reconciliation, trust, respect for human rights, equality and the rule of law are key to a successful referendum process. These are the following outcomes which have been translated to projects under the peacebuilding priority plan;

#### **Outcome 1**

Relationship and trust between GoPNG and ABG are strengthened to contribute to effective implementation of autonomy arrangements and of the Bougainville Peace Agreement.

#### **Outcome 2**

People of Bougainville are empowered to make informed choices at the Bougainville referendum and to have increased confidence in the BPA process through access to more objective and accurate information and to for a for dialogue and debate and with their political leaders.

#### **Outcome 3**

Community social cohesion and security in Bougainville are strengthened through opportunities to deal with conflict-related trauma effectively, and resolution of local disputed peacefully as well as through better access to information to access appropriate post-conflict support-services.

### **(ii) Peacebuilding Context**

The Autonomous Region of Bougainville (ARoB) is an autonomous region within the independent state of Papua New Guinea (PNG). The Bougainville conflict is rarely spoken about, yet it provides enormous insight into the role and impact of extractive industries and geopolitical interests on the environment and socio-economic and political dynamics. Throughout the 1990's Bougainville suffered a secessionist conflict officially called the "Bougainville Crisis." The bloody conflict lasted for twelve years until a ceasefire was negotiated which gave birth to the signing of the Bougainville Peace Agreement (BPA) in 2001. To implement the BPA, the Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG) was set up as an interim government to drive the peace process in accordance to laws, policies and strategies passed by the Bougainville House of Representatives. The United Nations (UN) has been one of the key international partners in peacebuilding efforts from the beginning, having played an active and important role in supporting the ABG and partners to implement the BPA.

To date the UN continues to support peacebuilding efforts in Bougainville, including through the packages of support funded by the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (UN PBF). The UN Secretary General declared PNG eligible for PBF support in 2013, which was followed by a comprehensive peace and development analysis and priority planning and resulted in a Peacebuilding Priority Plan approved by the Government of Papua New Guinea, Autonomous Region of Bougainville Government and the UN.

Three projects were developed and approved to implement the Priority Plan.

In addition to these projects, the UN PBF also approved funding (USD1.4 million) for two additional projects under its Immediate Response Facility (IRF) that focus on gender

responsiveness at the community and political level and aim to strengthen women's role in peacebuilding. Both these projects have phased out through a close of project evaluation.

## **Evaluation Objective**

To enable measurement of overall progress against the expected results outlined in the Peacebuilding Priority Plan, a joint M&E Plan was developed by the PBF Secretariat in consultation with the UN implementing partners and government counter-parts and managed by the PBF Secretariat. Whilst programme monitoring remains an on-going activity of the secretariat, several evaluations were conducted at different intervals to assess the project's level of progress. A baseline study was conducted in June 2016 to establish official baseline for the project, and a mid-term study was conducted in September 2017 to assess the project's progress from the baseline.

The Priority Plan was approved in 2014 and implementation commenced in August 2015 with a life span of 3 years this meant it was from 2015 - 2017. A no-cost extension of the project was granted in early 2018, so the new closure date is April 2018. With the closure date drawing close, a Close-of-Project evaluation is now planned to assess the overall progress of the project against its intended goals and objectives.

### **(i) Scope**

The close-of-project evaluation will respond to the following Key Questions:

#### **Quality and Relevance of Design**

Assess the continuing appropriateness and relevance of the Design. The project context, threats and opportunities may have changed during the project. Assess whether the objectives are still valid, and what adjustments have been made.

#### **Effectiveness**

Assess the major achievements of the project to date in relation to its stated objectives and intended results. As far as possible this should be a systematic assessment of progress based on monitoring data for the planned Goal, Objectives and Strategic Activities

- Focus on the higher-level results.
- Assess what has been achieved, the likelihood of future achievements, and the significance/ strategic importance of the achievements
- Refer to quantitative assessments as far as possible
- Include also qualitative evidence e.g. opinions on the project's effectiveness based on impressions and interviews with target groups, partners, government, etc.

Describe any major failures of the project to date, explaining why they have occurred.

Describe any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative).

Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case-studies, stories, best practice

#### **Efficiency of Planning and Implementation**

Assess to what extent resources are being used economically to deliver the project. Are plans being used, implemented and adapted as necessary? For example:

- Is the overall project action plan used and up to date?

- What % of activities in the workplan is being delivered?
- Is financial expenditure in line with plan?
- Is monitoring data being collected as planned, stored and used to inform future plans

Assess other programme management factors important for delivery, such as:

- Capacity gaps (these could be in the project team, other internal functions such as HR or Finance, or external organisations as appropriate).
- Working relationships within the team
- Working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors
- Learning processes such as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects.
- Internal and external communication

### **Potential for sustainability, replication and magnification**

Assess the key factors affecting sustainability of the project, such as:

- What is the social and political environment/ acceptance of the project?
- Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/ will ensure continuity of project activities in the project area?
- Is there evidence of organisations/partners/communities that have copied, upscaled or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area. Is such replication or magnification likely?

Assess whether the project can be considered as delivering value for money for its present scope/ scale of impact (it is recognised this will be a somewhat subjective view)?

- What are the cost implications for scaling up impact?
- Are there savings that could have been made without compromising delivery?

Assess and make recommendations on the key strategic options for the future of the project i.e. exit strategy, scale down, replication, scale-up, continuation, major modifications to strategy

- Comment on any existing plans
- Make recommendations in addition

## **(ii) Deliverables**

### **a) Activities and Responsibilities**

The institution which will be contracted will work with the PBF M&E Officer and the PBF Coordinator to execute the following tasks:

### **b) Preparations**

- Conduct a desk review of past reports, Results Framework, other documents including the baseline and the Mid-term Evaluation reports
- Develop a methodology for the collection of data
- Develop questionnaire against the key evaluation questions

### **c) Data Collection**

- Data Collection
- Clean and compile raw data gathered

**d) Analyse & Report**

- Analyse data gathered
- Develop a report of the methodology and findings against the key questions

The whole exercise is estimated to take 6 weeks, but the duration can be adjusted slightly, based on the approved proposal and its methodology.

**(iii) Documentation/data/information sources/guidelines that will be available at the beginning of the contract**

- Peacebuilding Priority Plan
- 4 PBF Project documents
- Baseline Evaluation Report
- Mid-term Evaluation Report
- Mid-year and Annual Project Progress reports (2015-2017)
- Risks Logs
- PBF M&E Plan and Results Framework

## **Institutional Arrangement**

**(i) Supervision**

The Close-of-Project Evaluation will be executed under the direct supervision of the PBF Coordinator through the PBF M&E Officer in Bougainville. The M&E Officer will provide further information on project activities and stakeholders and will facilitate liaison with government and stakeholders and implementing partners.

**(ii) Reporting**

The institution hired will report directly to the PBF Coordinator through the M&E Officer in Bougainville. It will report on a weekly basis on work progress and will work in close liaison with the PBF Secretariat all through the duration of the evaluation.

## **Duration of Work**

The contract days are estimated at 6 weeks for the Team Leader specialist and for his team (although the exact number of days and team composition is to be proposed by the bid and in accordance with the deliverables in these TORs). The work schedule proposes the duration of work within this timeframe immediately after the contract is signed. The work is estimated to commence no earlier than May 2018.

**(i) Timing of roles and responsibilities**

<b>Results</b>	<b>Weeks after signing contract</b>
Preparations	Week 1
Data Collection	Week 2 - 3
Analysis	Week 4
Reporting	Week 4 - 5
Any final amendments following feedback from stakeholders	Week 5 - 6

## **A. Geographical Area**

The Autonomous Region of Bougainville has (3), regions, (13) districts 33 constituencies and over 450 Wards. Decision on the specific locations for the evaluation will be proposed by the institution and agreed with the PBF Secretariat on the basis of the methodology and the proposed sample size. The Secretariat envisages representation of the three regions for this exercise, as well as specific focus on Buka, the National Government in Port Moresby and the ABG.

## **Education & Experience**

### **(i) Structure**

The consultancy is envisaged to be provided by an NGO, a research institute or a consultancy firm that is specialised in research, statistical work and surveys (design, tools, data collection & analysis), preferably in the field of peacebuilding and governance, with operating experience in volatile areas, with good knowledge of and networks in Bougainville, and with possibility to assemble a field team quickly in Bougainville (with the support of the UN which will provide a list of possible local team members). The structure should have a good understanding of the sensitivities and risk management strategies concerning surveys which deal with political and peacebuilding issues.

### **(ii) Qualification and Experience Required**

#### **Experience:**

- Should have at least a minimum of 7 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation and research, including survey design and conduct, data analysis and report writing.

#### **Education:**

- Hold a university degree (Bachelor), preferably in social sciences, statistics, demography, political science, law, international relations, public administration or economics and a thorough knowledge of qualitative methodologies.

#### **Competencies:**

- Good understanding of issues on peacebuilding and governance and experience in Bougainville are highly desirable.
- High level planning, organizational and time management skills, including flexibility, attention to detail and the ability to work under pressure to meet challenging deadlines;
- Excellent interpersonal skills, including ability to establish strong cooperative relationships with senior government officials, civil society and donors;
- Ability to quickly adapt to change, and to remain calm under pressure; and
- Proven cross-cultural communication and the ability to function effectively in an international, multicultural environment.

## Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The contract price is a fixed price based on the results, with the length of service being approximate.

The budget submission should include all costs to allow the implementation of activities provided for in Sections C and F, such as professional fees for team members, travel expenses, attachments, multiplication of survey questionnaires, etc.

The payment schedule will be directly related to the deliverable submissions and progress report after the baseline report is completed and certification by the Secretariat is done.

Activities/Weeks/Days	Duration	Amount	Weeks (%)
<b>Tr 1</b>			
<b>Preparations (Desk Review and development of methodology)</b>	Week 1	Tr 1	50%
<b>Data Collection</b>	Week 2	Tr 2	25%
<b>Analysis &amp; Submission of Final Report</b>	Week 6	Tr 3	25%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>		
			<b>100%</b>

## Evaluation

### Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%

\* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Qualification</b>		<b>15%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hold a university degree (Bachelor), preferably in social sciences, statistics, demography, political science, law, international relations, public administration or economics and a thorough knowledge of qualitative methodologies.</li> </ul>	15	
<b>Experience</b>		<b>30%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Should have at least a minimum of 7 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation and research, including survey design and conduct, data analysis and report writing.</li> </ul>	30	
<b>Competencies</b>		<b>25%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good understanding of issues on peacebuilding and governance and experience in Bougainville are highly desirable.</li> </ul>	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High level planning, organizational and time management skills, including flexibility, attention to detail and the ability to work under pressure to meet challenging deadlines;</li> </ul>	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Excellent interpersonal skills, including ability to establish strong cooperative relationships with senior government officials, civil society and donors;</li> </ul>	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ability to quickly adapt to change, and to remain calm under pressure; and</li> </ul>	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proven cross-cultural communication and the ability to function effectively in an international, multicultural environment.</li> </ul>	5	
<b>Technical Criteria</b>		<b>70%</b>
**If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.		
<b>Financial Criteria – Lowest Price</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>



## Documents to be included when submitting Consultancy Proposals

The following documents may be requested:

- a) Duly executed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP.
- b) **Signed P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment. Highlights of the relevant expertise and understanding of the TORs. Details of approach and a draft methodology proposed for the overall data collection based on the evaluation questions and work plan outline with composition of the proposed team.
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must stipulate that arrangement at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

### Lump-sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump-sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump-sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

### Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket; should the IC wish to travel on a higher class, they should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging, and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

